

SPEECH

OF

HON. C. F. CLEVELAND, OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 1, 1852,

ON THE HOMESTEAD BILL.

The bill to encourage agriculture, commerce, manufactures, and all other branches of industry, by granting to every man who is the head of a family and a citizen of the United States, a homestead of one hundred and sixty acres of land out of the public domain, upon condition of occupancy and cultivation of the same for the period therein specified, being under consideration in the Committee of the Whole—

Mr. CLEVELAND said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not propose on this occasion to consume the time of the committee by making what young gentlemen who have recently come to Congress consider a *speech*—one gotten up for publication. I ask, however, my slaveholding friends, and the Representatives of slaveholders, to listen for a while and learn a little of the *truth*; for I do not intend that they shall be cheated, or their goods or other valuable thing obtained under false pretenses. But before I come to that part of the few remarks which I intend to submit for their consideration, and the consideration of the committee, I desire to say a few words upon the subject legitimately before us.

A bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JOHNSON] to give to a class of men now landless a certain number of acres of the public domain, on condition that they will settle upon it and enrich themselves and the Government by its fruits. The proposition is one which that gentleman has with untiring perseverance presented to the consideration of the American people since a time when there was scarcely a voice in Congress to second the movement; but although it met with little favor at the commencement, yet his heart must be cheered by seeing that the time is near when this favorite project, for which he has so long and so manfully striven, will become a law; his wishes thereby accomplished, and the best interests and happiness of the people promoted. Sir, not only will the passage of this law gladden the hearts of our own enterprising citizens, but it will be a subject of deep-felt joy to the countless thousands who now, oppressed and poverty stricken, seek in this land a refuge beneath the stripes and stars.

Now, sir, from whence comes opposition to this bill? Why, sir, the only really formidable opposition made, and from which alone the bill is in any danger, comes, so far as I am able to discover, from those gentlemen who are desirous of obtaining from this Congress grants of the public lands to aid in building railroads. In the first place, I say frankly, that I believe if they are serious in their opposition, and mean to vote against this bill because the House did not see fit at once and without consideration to pass their bills, they will commit an error. Sir, that there will be railroads whenever and wherever the condition and resources of the country warrant their building, is a fact as certain as that this country is nearly, if not *entirely*, overrun by shrewd Yankees, who like to turn a sixpence wherever they can. There is no danger to be apprehended from the passage of this act. On the contrary, let me assure my friends that their railroads will be built much sooner by its success than by any other mode.

Mr. FREEMAN, (interrupting.) I am a member of the Committee on Public Lands, who have reported these railroad bills, and I have heard no opposition there to this measure. I believe that those who are most interested in the railroad bills are equally interested in the homestead bill.

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is right; I am rejoiced to hear it, because, permit me to say here, that I entertain some doubts in regard to these grants of public lands for railroad purposes. The granting of public lands to States, for the purpose of constructing railroads over lands now unoccupied, is fraught with some danger. There are benefits likely to result from it undoubtedly, but there are dangers also; and I feel it my duty to call the attention of the committee to them.

In the first place, no new State, that I am aware of, within the limits of the United States, is in a condition to benefit itself by taking these lands and raising the means of building the roads. This will be admitted by every friend of railroad projects. If they are not thus able, what must they do? Why they must necessarily get a *company*

to do it. And where is that company to come from? Everybody knows that it must be located in Wall street, New York, State street, Boston, or some such place. The brokers, who form the company, will take the stock for the purpose of making money, and they are the men who mainly will be benefited by it. What, then, are we called upon to do? To give away millions of acres of the public lands, and place them in the power of these companies. Will this benefit the Western States? No; for the lands will be in the hands of the stock-jobbers. Will they consult the interests of the new States? This can hardly be expected.

If charters are granted to these companies, who must be the owners of the land and stock, what will be the effect? Why, at the first view we should say that they would put the lands at once into market—bring in settlers—people the country. Wait a moment. They will want the benefit of the rise of the alternate sections, and to secure it, they will send their agents abroad to borrow money by a mortgage of the land granted; failing in that, they will issue their bonds with twenty years or more to run, and pledge the land thus given by Congress for the payment of them. This will necessarily keep the lands out of market for such length of time as suits the interest of the concern, and induce a necessity which will not only control and retard the sale and settlement of these lands, but will go far to create a power hostile to the best interests of the State. It will be for the interest of these corporations to hold on to their lands until the settlement of the alternate sections, sold by the Government, shall increase the value of their lands, thus held and kept out of market, ten fold.

I have another objection to these grants of land. This public domain is the property of all the States, as much the old as the new. What justice or fairness then is there in robbing one portion of the Republic to enrich another? If you are to embark in this extensive system of internal improvement, why should not the old States share in it? And another objection is, that if you give to one set of petitioners, you must give to all, and the numberless petitions now before us asking aid in this way proves this fact, and admonishes us that we should act cautiously in the premises. I yield to no man on this floor in my desire to benefit and build up the new States—those States who are adding so much to the glory and lasting prosperity of this Republic. But I ask them to pause and see whether they are not asking for that which will ultimately be a curse to themselves and the country.

I voted for the Illinois railroad bill last year, with great reluctance, and I have ever since regretted that vote. I did it because I desired to benefit our Western friends. They are very clever fellows, like all the other gentlemen on this floor, and my desire to accommodate everybody, and my known kindness of disposition, induced me to vote for it. But there was another consideration: It was said here that the Union was cracking; that it was about to be dissolved, and I thought that this iron band might help to stop the fracture; upon reflection, I have come to the conclusion that there was no such danger to the Union as timid, designing, and ambitious men represented, and that the vote which I gave in favor of that grant was not a wise one. I am not satisfied that I then

did what was right, and I have therefore, refused to do the same thing again. That is all I wish to say upon the subject of these railroads.

In regard to the grant of lands to actual settlers, I desire to see the Western States peopled to their fullest capacity, with men who can say, when they reach home after the labors of the day are over, "I AM IN MY OWN HOUSE." It may be a log-hut, but gentlemen know that, beneath their own roof-trees, and by their own fire-sides, they realize more comforts, and find what is nearer allied to paradise, than can be found elsewhere on God's foot-stool. This is true, in a greater degree, as a general rule, in the lowly log-cabin of the humblest citizen, than in the lordly mansion of the rich; and were it mine to choose, I would rather receive the blessings, gushing warm, from the hearts of those who shall be provided with homes by this bill, and which will be showered upon all who are instrumental in its passage, than live like Millard Fillmore in the White House—a home which he so unwillingly occupies, and which *every one else* is so anxious to keep clear of. [Laughter.] Yes, the men, women, and children, who live in log-huts, possess as much of virtue, true piety, and thankfulness of heart to God, and their friends, as can be found anywhere upon earth, and I hope and trust that we shall so act as when they are thanking God for his mercies, and thanking Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee, for his persevering efforts in their behalf, they may include the Thirty-second Congress, and especially the popular branch of it. So far as I am concerned, I shall do all I can to deserve it.

Passing from that topic, I wish to say a few words about another matter. I allude to the resolution which is on your table, indorsing the fugitive slave law, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. JACKSON,] which he promised the public in a speech delivered here, and a copy of which has been sent to my desk, he never would vote for, either in caucuses of the members of the House, or in the House itself. He says that distinctly in his speech, if I have read it aright, for I did not hear it delivered.

But, sir, my honorable friend from Georgia, no doubt from the purest and most patriotic motives, (for I believe him actuated by none other,) has changed his mind in relation to this matter. He now thinks it expedient to have this resolution offered. And what object is to be gained by its passage? Is it to stop agitation? Truly, a most singular plan, this, to revive all the bitterness and acrimony of the past two sessions, in order, *finally*, to quiet it? Why, sir, with all due respect to the honorable gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. JACKSON,] who offered it, and to those gentlemen who are anxious for its introduction into this House, I say that should it pass, it will fasten a mark of disgrace upon us that nothing can obliterate! I ask, is it the part of wisdom to pass a law, and after that law is not only in actual operation, but no efforts made for its repeal, to allow a resolution to be introduced by certain individuals into this House *repealing* that law, merely for the purpose of reading somebody else out of the Democratic party, and reading themselves in, thereby changing their present respective positions? Are we to be made the tools of these men, by thus reindorsing the law we ourselves have made? Let it be done, and I tell gentlemen it will stand as a

mark of folly against this Congress so long as men continue to meet in legislative bodies.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Certainly; but I ask the gentleman to be as short as possible.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman charges me with inconsistency, first, for introducing a resolution after I had a few days before voted to lay a similar resolution on the table in the Democratic caucus at the opening of the present session; and second, because I had stated as my reason for having done so, that I was opposed to introducing the subject of slavery either into the Democratic caucus, or into Congress. I was opposed to it, and I did not introduce my proposition for a declaration of the finality of the compromise measures until speeches had been delivered upon the floor by at least the two gentlemen from Ohio, [Messrs. GIDDINGS and CAMPBELL,] and the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. RANTOUL,] in open hostility to the fugitive slave law. When that was done, I considered it time for such a resolution to be introduced.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have no doubt of the honorable motives which actuated the gentleman from Georgia. I have been with him for three sessions nearly, and I freely say that I have seen no act, I have heard no word, nothing upon his part, which indicates in the slightest degree that he is not in every respect worthy of the position he now occupies upon this floor. I know that he is above everything like trick or management. Everything is fair and open to the light of day and the examination of the world. But, nevertheless, permit me to say, that from the reasons given by the gentleman from Georgia, I am surprised that he should have been brought to such a result; for the same facts precisely have operated upon my mind, and I certainly have not come to a similar conclusion. I ask gentlemen to look for a moment at the manifest impropriety of the thing? Look at the ridiculous position in which we shall be placed by the passage of such a resolution. Am I to be driven into such an act of folly because other people act improperly? No, sir; wherever I stand, I intend it shall be upon my own position, and not upon that of somebody else.

But if no objections existed to this resolution upon the ground of propriety, I have another which would effectually prevent me from giving it my assent. It proposes to indorse the infamous fugitive slave law, a purely Whig measure, in its origin and principles; and that it is such I will demonstrate so that no man upon this floor can deny it.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have no time to spare, but I will accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman says the fugitive slave law is purely a Whig measure. Now, I want to know whether the gentleman has reference to my resolution or to the fugitive slave law?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Oh, the fugitive slave law, certainly. I did not mean, when speaking of the conduct of the Whigs, to reflect upon the gentleman's resolution.

My Whig friends around me seem delighted that I should give them the credit of this measure, which is so obnoxious to right-minded men, because of its inhumanity and wanton violation of the

rights of the citizen, particularly as it denies to the person claimed as a fugitive from labor the right of trial by a jury in the State where arrested. What objection is made to this right? The insulting one, that the men who fill our jury boxes in the free States are base enough to commit the crime of perjury, and fail to render a verdict in accordance with the testimony, in order to screen the fugitive, and thus deprive the master of his services. And yet the assertion is made with the greatest coolness, for selfish and party purposes, that this law is popular with the people; and men are additionally insulted by the request that they will vote for the elevation of the very men who entertain such opinions of their integrity as law-abiding citizens. I tell you, gentlemen, you will live to see the day, or, if you do not, your sons will, when the very mention of this as your measure will cause a blush of shame, to think that you should have been guilty of such consummate folly and want of principle.

I regret to see that our outside friends from the South had not a little more of nerve, and a little less indecision, in resisting these acts of the last Congress—in resisting that assumption of power upon the part of Congress. In my opinion, the passage of the fugitive slave law was precisely such a stretch of power in principle as was the passage of the alien and sedition laws upon the part of the Congress passing them.

I tell Democrats who are so anxious to connect their names with the support of the slave law of the last Congress, that the power it places in the hands of the Executive is an hundred fold more dangerous to the liberties of the citizen than the alien and sedition laws, which made the administration of the elder Adams so odious in the eyes of all honest Democrats. And what use have we seen the Executive make of this law within the first few months of its existence? Because of a negro riot in Boston, he asked that Congress should pass a law giving him power to call out the militia and shoot down unsuspecting citizens before they are notified of their offenses. And, on another occasion, when a fatal occurrence, growing out of the attempted enforcement of this same law in Pennsylvania, the Executive attempted to engraft upon our system of jurisprudence the law of constructive treason—a more dangerous stretch of power than has ever before been attempted since the formation of this Government.

Do gentlemen see no danger in all this? And especially do Democrats who are jealous of the power of the Executive see no danger to our republican institutions in these acts? What is now done under this law to aid and support slaveholders by the present Executive may establish a precedent, by virtue of which some other not quite so friendly may wield this new power against them, and it may be against the rights of the States. Thanks to an intelligent and patriotic jury, the Executive and his subordinates were foiled in their purpose, and we have not yet to record this principle upon our system of jurisprudence.

Mr. FLORENCE. Will the gentleman permit me to make a single explanation? I am sure the position I occupied in the Christiana trials entitles me to it. I was foreman of the grand jury that brought in the bills to which the gentleman alludes in this treason case.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sorry to hear it.

Mr. FLORENCE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him whether he ever read the testimony in this case? Or the charge of the district judge?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes, both; and I acquit the grand jury. But if I had jurisdiction over the judge, I would not acquit him. I will excuse the gentleman [Mr. Florence] for what he did, because he placed confidence in the judge who charged the jury.

Mr. FLORENCE. I thought the gentleman had not read the testimony, or he would not have arrived at such conclusions. However, I suppose we in Pennsylvania are not as intelligent as they are in Connecticut. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLEVELAND. I entertain all due respect for Pennsylvania. Indeed, I have sometimes so far forgot myself, as to say she was the only slave State north of Mason and Dixon's line, [laughter,] but I will take that back. There is no doubt of Pennsylvania's intelligence and loyalty; but loyalty to what? To the principles of humanity, or to party? There are different species of loyalty—to God, to your fellow-man, and even to the devil, [renewed laughter.]

A MEMBER. And loyalty to Locofocoism.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes, and loyalty, sorry am I to say, to Whigism too. But, Mr. Chairman, I promised to show that this fugitive slave law was purely of Whig origin. These compromises grew out of Mr. Clay's eight resolutions, which he introduced without consultation with any one; and who will say that Mr. Clay was anything but a Whig? I have great respect for the old gentleman; I give him all credit for purity of motive; still it is known that, when these resolutions were first introduced, they were opposed by Mr. Foote, and other gentlemen, most violently. They were carried along, however, until the current changed. Then Mr. Foote advocated them, and ultimately moved the appointment of the committee of thirteen. Mr. Clay was at the head of that committee, and drew up the compromise resolutions and the report. When that report, with the resolutions, was published, General Taylor, who said a good many comical things, and once, at Buena Vista, *did* a comical one, said "away with your omnibus bills, I will set my face as a flint against the whole of them." Then there was trouble. I well remember the expression on the faces of some parties when Daniel Webster whispered in the ear of Henry Clay, that the old man was dying. I need not, however, state what it was.

Mr. WHITE, of Alabama. I desire that the gentleman will inform us, what indications he saw in the face of Daniel Webster, at the time to which he alludes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I will tell the gentleman. It did not look much like attending a funeral. [Laughter.] I do not complain of this; I do not say there was even anything remarkable, or improper, in it. I merely state what I saw; and when Daniel Webster delivered his eulogy upon the General's life and character, he said, in substance, that if the country was saved, even by the death of such a man as Zachary Taylor, we might well rejoice. The gentleman can read the book, and I will send him one if he has not seen it. He can there judge for himself whether I have misstated the idea conveyed.

Why, Mr. Chairman, at that time there was no

more chance of the passage of this omnibus bill, or the fugitive slave law, than that you, Mr. Chairman, or the next best man, will be translated to Heaven for holiness. [Great laughter.]

But Mr. Clay, as I have shown, had conceived the plan. Mr. Webster, for reasons best known to himself, had made his 7th of March speech. General Taylor died, and Mr. Fillmore took command of the ship of state, discharged the old and shipped a new crew, with Mr. Webster as first officer, hoisted the compromise flag, and started on his Southern cruise. What motive governed Mr. Fillmore in this entire change of the policy of the Administration—whether it was love of slavery and power, or hatred of his rival, Governor Seward, I am not able to say; and I believe the country is equally unenlightened on the subject. General Scott was, by Mr. Fillmore, placed temporarily at the head of the War Department, and, in that position, coupled with his great military fame, was able to, and did, exert a powerful influence in favor of these compromise measures. Here, then, is every man whose name has been mentioned, or is likely to be mentioned, as a candidate for the presidency on the Whig side, viz., Clay, Webster, Fillmore, and Scott,—all exerting themselves to the utmost in pushing through this series of measures, the slave-law included. And what was the position of these distinguished Whigs? One was at the head of the Government; another in command of the Army; and the other two, (one living in a slave, the other in a free State,) the most distinguished men of their party, and perhaps of the nation. Now, let us see what Democrats, who are at all prominent, aided those Whigs in passing the slave bill. Two, only, were active, and exerted any considerable influence—Governor Foote, in the Senate, and Speaker Cobb, in the House. And what became of them? Both threw themselves into the arms of the Whigs, in their respective States, and both are now Governors of those States by virtue of Whig votes, and both have been here this winter, exerting themselves to obtain the passage of these resolutions affirming the compromise, to relieve them from their present dilemma. Did the distinguished Senator from Illinois vote for this slave law? No. Governor Cass, one of the most distinguished men of the nation and of his party, did not record his vote in favor of this Federal bantling; nor, in fact, did any Democrat, whose position was one of mark, except those who have since formed a coalition with the Whigs. In view of these facts, who will say that this fugitive slave law was not of Whig, or Federal, origin?

When Mr. Fillmore got into the White House, the first business was to pacify the country. There had been a great deal of remark because the House did not elect a Speaker for the first three weeks of the session; and the prevalent impression seemed to be that the Free-Soilers were about to overturn the world because they were in favor of keeping the territory which you had acquired from Mexico, just as Mexico had made it, and as God had intended it, *free!* The Constitution was to be overturned, because we did not give one half of that territory in which to establish slavery, and in a country, too, as free as Connecticut. At this very time, the whole power of the Whig Administration was cast into the scale of this compromise. I desire to do justice to the man who has

been arraigned here, and charged with hostility to these measures, or at least that he did not, or does not, commit himself in favor of them. Justice to that distinguished Whig requires of me that I should say he could not have done more. He was as active a man as could be found in getting these compromise measures passed. I was here, and heard from every quarter that General Scott was as active and energetic in his efforts as any man in Washington, and never did a man labor harder than General Scott to prevail upon the Free-Soil members of the Whig party to abandon their position and adopt the compromise as a measure of the new Administration. They had a sort of second pentecost on the Whig side of the House. They went over and out by scores. I am a little free-soilish, though not Whiggish, and I was opposed to this operation; and I was sorry to lose my Whig allies. But they went; and why? Because Mr. Fillmore had to be sustained, or the Whig party ruined. They did not go because they had changed their sentiments—

“A man convinced against his will,
Is of the same opinion still.”

All the great North, and the great Northern heart beats true to liberty. God in his mercy never made a company of men, and planted them upon this earth, who would shed their blood with a readier will for the liberties of the world, than the people of the Northern States; and they have given good evidence of it. Any gentleman who undertakes to make you believe that we love slave-holding, or running after fugitive slaves, is attempting to humbug you. He knows it is not true when he tells it. There is not a word of truth in it. If you believe it, you deceive yourselves.

But I must pass on. These measures were passed mainly through the influence of Clay, Fillmore, Webster, Scott, Foote, and Cobb. These were the men who carried them through, and every man who was in the last Congress knows it.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen should misunderstand me in this matter. I stated, and distinctly, that this measure—this compromise—was a thoroughly Whig move from its commencement. This I stand to, and think I have proved; but I do not mean to say that it did not receive the support of many Democrats after it had received its first impetus from Whig hands. Many such did vote for it; did aid it under the mistaken idea, as time has proven, that it was the best, the only means of saving a Union then tottering to its fall. So many of these, in fact, joined in its support, that soon after its passage, it really seemed a question as to which side should have the credit of its paternity. If other proof was needed, however, I might point to the first Union meeting held in Hartford, Connecticut, a place somewhat celebrated in Federal annals for its “conventions.” That meeting was attended by the Whigs in great numbers, and its presiding officer was a leading member of the Whig party; and it really seems as though it was no fault of Democrats who figured on that occasion, that their party was not merged with the Whigs altogether. The same juggle was practiced in New Haven. They had a meeting there, and, I believe, the last one held in the country, at which a doctor of divinity, who does up theology for Yale College, made a speech in favor of the fugitive slave law. I ask, in passing, is he not the man who said he

would choose between two devils for President, and should vote for Henry Clay because he was a less devil than James K. Polk?

Mr. INGERSOLL. Can I explain?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Who was the doctor you allude to?

Mr. INGERSOLL. Doctor Taylor, the Professor of Theology.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is he not the man who said he would choose the least of two devils for President?

Mr. INGERSOLL. I wish to explain.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I may be mistaken, but I think not; and this is the diviné whose opinions are to influence the ministers of the Gospel in this land of liberty and morality.

Permit me to say—for I may never have as good a chance again—that of all creatures that creep upon their bellies upon earth, I most despise the man who pretends to preach the gospel of Christ—of that Saviour who was cradled in a manger, who went about doing good, and who told John's disciples, when they were sent to know whether he was the Christ, or they should look for another, Go and tell John that “the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them”—and is ready to proclaim himself the champion of slaveholders. What a loathing the high-minded slaveholder must have for such a teacher of religion and morals! Does the religion of Jesus Christ tolerate buying and selling men? Does it tolerate selling your brother and your sister? When you stand before that tribunal, when you must give an account before an impartial Judge, you will find those slaves, bought and sold by you, standing by your side; and the questions, Have you fed my hungry poor? have you clothed my naked poor? have you given them the rights God intended they should have? is asked, what will the answer be? No. What will be your apology? They were black. Black! Who made them so? Dare you reproach your Maker, because he saw fit to make another's skin black, and your's white? Did He give you any right to tyrannize over His child, because He, in his wisdom, saw fit to make him black? And if you then stand speechless, where will be found the sleek, miserable, dough-faced apologist for such a system of iniquity? If slave buyers and sellers go to hell, it seems to me there should be some other word coined to describe the place where Northern men who uphold the practice, and especially professed ministers of the gospel, should go.

Mr. VENABLE, (interrupting.) Will the gentleman tell me what has been done with the money you made in Connecticut by selling negroes kidnapped from Africa? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLEVELAND. If we made any, we invested it in common-school education, to enable us to send our boys of thirteen to instruct your men of twenty-five in North Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. VENABLE. In stealing negroes?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No; in science and morals.

But I wish to say one word more to my Southern friends. When you trust yourselves in the hands of these slippery politicians, who are merely office-seekers, and who have no higher principle

to govern them than that growing out of their insatiate craving for the loaves and fishes, you may depend upon it, they will desert you the moment it is for their interest. I proclaim it, that there is no security for your rights except in the integrity of those true sons of the North who dare stand up, like honest men, and proclaim their faith in the Constitution, their trust in Heaven, and their devotion to man's rights, as men—who dare stand up and tell you that they are opposed to slavery, but that they will abide by the provisions of the Constitution. You may trust a man who will tell you to your face that he abhors your system, but will protect your rights—that up to the limits of the Constitution he will protect your institutions; but beyond them, never.

My colleague intimated that the Democracy of Connecticut were anxious to have these resolutions passed—that such was the feeling in Connecticut. Just before he commenced his speech I received a paper, the principal organ of the Democracy of Connecticut, from which I will read a short extract.

MR. CHAPMAN. What is the name of the paper?

MR. CLEVELAND. The Hartford Times—good authority for my colleague, [MR. INGERSOLL.]

"Governor Foote has sent a long message to the Mississippi Legislature, introducing the subject of the finality of the compromise measures, and the war between the States rights and the Union men has been thereupon renewed.

"Foote's resolution, making the compromise a 'finality' in the United States Senate, has never kicked since General Houston knocked in its iron-piece, in a speech of an hour and twenty minutes. That was the last of it. But Foote is after a 'finality,' and if he can't corner the Jack-o'-lantern in the United States Senate, he will try to cage it in the Mississippi Legislature. He has a great talent to stir up contentions, get into fights and personalities, and to rake up private conversations. There is but little of practicability in his movements, however, and his Mississippi 'finality' will do just what he did in the Senate—make much ill-feeling and stir up an angry contention over a series of peace measures that have long since been adopted and quietly acquiesced in; and which will make no trouble unless some 'agitator' like Foote pokes up embers around them."

This designates my colleague, [MR. INGERSOLL.] He had no idea that he was by the assertion made incurring the censures of the Times. For General, Senator, or Governor Foote, whatever his title may be, I have all proper respect, but I would not like to have my young friend, for whom I entertain the kindest feelings, associated with him as a politician.

My honorable colleague [MR. INGERSOLL.] stepped out of his course to assail the honorable member from Massachusetts, [MR. RANTOUL.] He compared him to Benedict Arnold and Aaron Burr, and denounced him as an *apostate*! Pretty strong language this, for one honorable member to use to another! And why is he thus denounced? Is it not in consequence of the views he entertains in regard to slavery and the fugitive slave law? And did not my honorable colleague know full well that my sentiments on this subject were, in the main, the same as those entertained by Mr. RANTOUL? Can any one fail to see that the blow was aimed at myself quite as much as at Mr. RANTOUL? And is this the kind of politeness my young friend has learned by his foreign travels? What occasion have I given him to denounce me as an apostate? and by what authority does he do it? Have I ever changed my opinions on this subject?

Have I ever failed to express them fearlessly, on all proper occasions? And have I not always been sustained by the Democracy of my State? Does the honorable gentleman know of any man in the State we in part represent who has oftener been a candidate for office, or who has been more generously sustained than myself? Does the man live who knows me, who will charge me with deserting my principles, or playing any trick to obtain office or position anywhere? If the gentleman will deny any one of these claims, I will give him time to do it.

Will the gentleman pretend that I have ever been a candidate for a seat in either branch of Congress, when I have not been regularly nominated by what is known as the old line Democracy. It is true I have twice received the nomination of the Free Soilers of my district for a seat in the House, of which I am proud. Yet I never in my life voted any other ticket in my state than what is termed the regular Democratic ticket. Is my district to be assailed in the person of her Representative because they send a man here who loves freedom, and hates slavery? Within the limits of that district rest the bones of Israel Putnam, who commanded at the first battle of the Revolution, and the bones of Ledyard who poured out his heart's blood to purchase liberty for all; and the bones of a host of others as true and fearless friends of freedom as the sun of heaven ever shone upon. And are their sons to be reproached because they prefer freedom to slavery? and free soil to slave soil? And how stands the case with the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, who is attacked by name? Is there a Democrat within the limits of New England, who has done greater, or better service in the cause of Democracy, than he? Has he ever failed to be the favorite of his party in his own State? Where will the gentleman look to find a man with more of education, talent, and private worth, than the gentleman whom he thus rudely assails? It is true he made a speech at Lynn on the subject of this fugitive slave law, which I will read extracts from:

"But when I say that I admire and love both the Union and the Constitution, it is because of that which they secure to us. The Union is great, I might almost say, it is the greatest of our political blessings, because it secures to us what was the object of the Union. And the Constitution is good, and great, and valuable, and to be held forever sacred, because it secures to us what was the object of the Constitution. And what is that? Liberty! And if it were not for that, the Union would be valueless, and the Constitution would not be worth the parchment upon which it is written." * * * "Interwoven with every fibre of my heart is the love of my country; but freedom is the charm which endears and consecrates her; and if the spirit of liberty should take her flight from my native land, my love and worship are not due to brute clods and rocks, to her prairies, or her mountains; but, where Liberty dwells, there is my country—there only is my country! [Great applause.] Dear to my inmost soul are the Union and the Constitution; but God-given liberty is above the Union, and above the Constitution, and above all the works of man." * * *

"The tendency of my steps this day, is to tread the path our fathers trod, THE PATH OF FREEDOM AND PROGRESS. My hope and trust is, to hand down to posterity—not only uninspired, but strengthened and augmented—all the safeguards of liberty, which, through many ages of long suffering, the toil of patriots earned, and the blood of martyrs hallowed, and which the fathers of the American Revolution died believing that they had secured forever."

Are these sentiments which justify my honorable friend in comparing him to *Arnold* and *Burr*?

And do such sentiments make a man an apostate from Democracy? If so, I wish there were more such apostates. Let me see now, with what propriety my colleague [Mr. INGERSOLL] makes this attack. He compliments his own constituents as the most devoted friends of Southern institutions; and one would suppose that the district sending to Congress such a champion of Southern rights and Southern institutions had never soiled its fair fame by the least association with, or support of Free-Soil men or measures! But what is the fact? Will my friends from the South who were members of the last Congress, believe me when I tell them, that my colleague is the successor of the Hon. Mr. Booth, than whom, a more worthy, gentleman, or honorable man, never held a seat on this floor. Yet he was at the time of his nomination, and had been for years, a distinguished member of the Liberty party, and had zealously supported their candidates and not the candidates of the Democratic party. All this was perfectly well known to the Democratic convention who put him in nomination, and who gave him a united, energetic, and successful support. Of this I do not complain, for he was an honor to the district, and, in my judgment, truly represented the honest sentiments of a vast majority of its citizens. I mention it merely to show with what justice and propriety the present Representative of that district makes his Southern demonstrations in this House. If my honorable colleague [Mr. INGERSOLL] lives to attain the standing of Mr. RANTOUL for learning, talent, and all that marks the gentleman, he may well be proud of his success, even if a long life is devoted to the effort.

Permit me to assure you, Mr. Chairman, this committee, and the country, that the people of Connecticut are not in love with slavery; they do not wish its extension; and with their consent it never will be extended beyond its present limits. But while they feel thus, they will give to the South all its constitutional privileges; they will stand by you in support of your legal rights with as much fidelity as any men that live, for there are not a more honorable body of men upon the earth than the people of my State. I have ever acted with integrity towards those men, and have, to the extent of my knowledge, truly represented their wishes. I voted in accordance with the instructions given me upon the subject of slavery, of which the following are copies:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, July 30, 1850. }

Sir: I have the honor to transmit to you the accompanying resolutions, adopted by the General Assembly of this State, at its session in May last.

I am, sir, with great respect, your obedient servant.

THOS. H. SEYMOUR.

To Hon. CHAUNCEY F. CLEVELAND.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY, May Session, 1850. }

Whereas, The people of Connecticut have heretofore, through their Senators and Representatives in General Assembly convened, solemnly and deliberately avowed their purpose to resist, in all constitutional and proper ways, the extension of slavery into the national territories, and the admission of new slave States into the Federal Union; and also to seek, in a peaceable and constitutional way, the abolition of the slave trade, and of slavery in the District of Columbia; and whereas, the important questions now before the country touching these matters make it desirable that these convictions and determinations should be reaffirmed in the most solemn and public manner: Therefore

Resolved, That Congress has full constitutional power to

prohibit slavery in the Territories of the United States by legislative enactment, and that it is the duty of Congress to pass, without unnecessary delay, such strict and positive laws as will effectually shut out slavery from every portion of these territories.

Resolved, That Congress has like full constitutional power to remove slavery and the slave trade from the District of Columbia; and that this power should be at once exercised for the immediate prohibition of the slave trade therein, and for the abolition of slavery, upon such terms of compensation to the slaveholders as may be just and reasonable.

Resolved, That in the name of the people of Connecticut, we do hereby solemnly reaffirm our unalterable attachment to the Federal Union, and our inflexible determination to adhere to our national Constitution, and abide by all its compromises, to the letter and in the spirit of the same; while, with equally unalterable and inflexible purpose, deterred by no threat of disunion, we shall forever oppose any and every measure of compromise, by which any portion of the territory now belonging to or which may hereafter be acquired by the United States, shall be given up to, or left unprotected against the encroachments of slavery.

Resolved, That the integrity and permanency of American power on the Pacific ocean, the increase of our commerce and wealth, the extension of our institutions, and the cause of human freedom on this continent, require the immediate admission of California into this Union, with her present constitution, and the boundaries therein defined, without any reference to any other question or measure whatever.

Resolved, That inasmuch as the legislation necessary to give effect to the clause of the Constitution of the United States, relating to the delivering up of fugitive slaves, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, we hold it to be the duty of that body to pass such laws in regard thereto as will secure to all persons whose surrender may be claimed, as having escaped from labor or service in another State, the right of having the validity of such claim determined by a jury in the State where such claim shall be made.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to each of the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States, who are hereby requested to present the same to the House to which they respectively belong.

SENATE, June 13, 1850.—Passed.

H. J. FULLER, Clerk.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, June 19, 1850.—Passed.

E. S. CLEVELAND, Assistant Clerk.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,

HARTFORD, July 26, 1850. }

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the original resolutions, on file in this office.

JOHN F. C. MATHER,

Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a single question? I wish to inquire of the gentleman, whether he was not the nominee of the Democratic party and of the Free-soil party, in his District?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Both, as I before stated, and should not have been surprised if I had been the nominee of the Whigs. There was no trouble about my election, and the reason probably was because I never proved false to my principles, and because I never failed to speak out my honest convictions before any tribunal and under any circumstances. If any man is fit to represent them in the Congress of this great nation, it is that man who stands up and speaks out the honest convictions of his own heart, and who does not go trucking and trimming and running around to see how somebody else will vote, and see whether he can get this position or that position, by his subservency to slaveholders, and to that system which George Washington condemned in the most solemn act of his life, the emancipation of his slaves. I would not surrender my independence, or my principles, for any position in the gift of my State, or of the American people.

[Here the hammer fell.]